THE U.F.O. Investigator

FACTS ABOUT FLYING SAUCERS (UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS)

— Published by the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena —

Vol. 1, No. 5 August-September, 1958

TWO HUGE UFOs SIGHTED BY BALTIMORE ASTRONOMER

A dramatic sighting of two enormous UFOs, kept from the public for four years, has now been confirmed to NICAP by Dr. James C. Bartlett, Jr., noted Baltimore astronomer. Doctor Bartlett, a frequent contributor to astronomical journals and now a NICAP Special Adviser, kept silent about this and other UFO sightings for several years because he believed the objects to be secret US developments.

Before these personal sightings, Doctor Bartlett was a complete skeptic, to the point of ridiculing anyone who believed in the reality of UFOs.

The sighting of the two large UFOs occurred at night at the end of September 1953 while Doctor Bartlett was observing a transit of the star, Fomalhaut. At first four large lights were seen by the naked eye and then immediately observed through 7-power binoculars.

"The lights moved slowly," states Doctor Bartlett. "They came from the noses of two enormous craft which more than filled the binoculars." The craft were quite low apparently at about 3,000 feet altitude. A cabin was observed in the nose, and ports on the sides of the hulls in each craft, which were either cylindrical or cigar-shaped. A sound like a piston engine at great height emanated from the craft, but these were not airliners nor were they dirigibles.

"At the time, I believed them to be a US secret, and it was not until late in 1957 that I revealed the sighting, to a group of Washington astronomers," says Doctor Bartlett. "I believed these were secret developments because they were apparently unmolested in the vicinity of, and over, many of our highly sensitive installations. Later, I noticed an occurrence pattern that showed that these craft appeared on a worldwide basis — over Communist territory as well as over our own.

"During the Korean conflict both sides shot at one of these craft, and obviously each side thought them to be enemy machines. This clearly implied that they were of unknown origin."

During the 7-year period in which Doctor Bartlett changed from utter skepticism to public acceptance of UFO reality, he has made several sightings of UFOs. These occurred during his almost nightly observation of our Moon, the planets, and distant stars, with the exception of a daylight sighting on August 5, 1952. On this date he was making

(continued on page 3)

Dr. Jung Sets Record Straight

"My special preoccupation does neither preclude the physical reality of the UFOs nor their extraterrestrial origin, nor the purposefulness of their behaviour, etc. But I do not possess *sufficient* evidence, which would enable me to draw definite conclusions. The evidence available to me, however, is convincing enough to arouse a continuous and fervent interest. I follow with my greatest sympathy your exploits and your endeavours to establish the truth about the UFOs."

Thus Dr. Carl G. Jung, world-famous psychologist, in a letter to NICAP's Director, attempts to correct the unfortunate misunderstanding which resulted from inexact quotation of his views by a British magazine, which quotation — since it had remained undenied for several years due to Doctor Jung's ignorance of its existence — was sincerely reprinted in a bulletin of the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization (APRO) at Alamagordo, New Mexico, in July 1958.

> Though dated September, this issue counts as the number due in August, which was held up by conditions explained in the Director's report. A 4-page bulletin, to count as the September publication, is now being prepared.

For those not acquainted with the full details, the main points of this situation are given here in chronological order:

1. In July 1954 Doctor Jung permitted an interview regarding UFOs, which was published in Die Weltwoche, a Swiss newspaper. In this interview, Doctor Jung stated his interest in the subject and examined several possibilities — such as physical reality, psychological manifestations, and so forth — but he made it plain that he had formed no absolute conclusion.

2. In the May-June 1955 issue of the British magazine, *Flying Saucer Review*, portions of the Weltwoche interview were reprinted, which, probably through errors in translation or through the necessity for reducing wordage, resulted in the impression being given that Doctor Jung fully endorsed the reality of UFOs, if not fully accepting them as interplanetary spaceships.

3. From 1955 until the summer of 1958, this article was referred to at various times by UFO investigators and it

(continued on page 3)

EXPERT ENDORSES SAUCER SHAPE FOR SPACE FLIGHT

A saucer-shaped craft is vastly superior to one of spherical shape for entering the earth's atmosphere, according to Dr. W. F. Hilton, Chief Aerodynamicist, Armstrong-Whitworth Aircraft Co., in England.

In a statement for NICAP, sent with his evaluation of the problem, Dr. Hilton also said their experiments had led his group to favor a circular plan-form (shape) rotated for spin stabilization and artificial gravity in space. He also described a plan to deflect heated air from a space vehicle by means of electro-magnets. (Dr. Hilton holds degrees as D.Sc., Ph.D., and is a Fellow of the Royal Aeronautical Society.)

Dr. Hilton said that he has an open mind on the question of "observation by other intelligent beings," but he has not accepted this belief. At the same time, he stated, he would point out "that any other intelligent being attempting to enter our atmosphere would presumably be subject to the same laws of nature applying to us."

In regard to the heating effect, Dr. Hilton gave NICAP the following evaluation:

"From a study of thermonuclear work on the 'pinch' effect, we decided to try the effect of magnetic fields on the hot flow from our company's shock tube. The basis of this interaction is the very great heating of the air behind the shock wave from the front of the vehicle.

"This heating causes the air to become partially ionized into electrically charged particles, and these particles in rapid motion past the vehicle have the nature of an electric current. They are therefore susceptible to deflection by means of a magnet.

"So far our results have been very encouraging, and we have been able to provide quite definite deviations with a small electro-magnet powered by a 12 volt battery. Whether this effect will lead to a practical contribution to re-entry remains to be established."

Discussing the evaluations by his group, in his technical paper "Re-Entry and Recovery," Dr. Hilton has used a saucer-shaped vehicle with a dome-shaped pilot's compartment, for basic calculations. The main points include:

1. Probable use of small rocket jets to produce and counteract pitching, yawing and rolling.

(continued on page 3)

The UFO INVESTIGATOR

Published by

the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena

1536 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.

Copyright 1958 National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena. All rights reserved; except that up to 400 words may be used, with proper NICAP credit, by press, broadcasting stations and UFO magazines.

Donald E. Keyhoe, Director and Editor
Richard Hall, Associate Editor

Richard Hall becomes Assoc. Editor

NICAP is fortunate in acquiring the services of Mr. Richard Hall, experienced UFO investigator. Mr. Hall is now carrying on the duties of Associate Editor and assisting the Director in other office work. Because NICAP is losing two members of its staff – Mrs. Rose H. Campbell, Administrator-Treasurer, and Mrs. Bessie M. Clark, Administrative Assistant – Mr. Hall's joining with NICAP is particularly timely. Without the aid of some one so well versed in the UFO problem, it would be difficult to continue operations.

Born in Hartford, Conn., Mr. Hall was graduated from Gilbert High School, Winsted, Conn., in 1948 and in 1949 enlisted in the Air Force. After basic training at Lackland AFB, he served at Keesler AFB; during the Korean War, his enlistment was extended, ending with his transfer to the inactive reserve in 1951.

Mr. Hall enrolled in Tulane University in 1954, and graduated in 1958 with a B.A. degree in philosophy and a minor in mathematics. Several years before this, he became interested in the UFO subject, building up a file of sightings and establishing connections with other investigators here and abroad. During his stay at Tulane, he edited and published "The Satellite," which was soon recognized as strictly factual in its approach to the UFO problem.

Because of this careful approach and his wide experience in this field, NICAP and its members are certain to benefit from his appointment as Associate Editor.

As explained in the Director's report, one-year members may renew for the second full year for $2.50. Since their $7.50 membership already has been extended to cover 18 months, the $2.50 renewal will complete the second year payment.

We plan to let members know the date when renewal would be due, but lack of office help may delay this. Please check the date when you joined and help NICAP by extending your membership to two years, at $2.50.

Miller Q & A

Maj. Donald E. Keyhoe recently answered a series of questions about NICAP submitted in writing by Max B. Miller, the editor of "Saucers." As the questions can be fitted into our schedule, NICAP will be glad to do the same for other UFO magazines. To facilitate handling of the questions, editors are requested to list them on a separate sheet of paper.

Second Class Mailing

To cut expenses, NICAP has been forced to abandon sending the magazine by first-class mail, which would now require not only more postage but the extra cost of envelopes. A second class permit has been applied for; if this is not granted, the publications will be sent third-class.

Heretofore, first-class mail was used, despite the added cost, because of delays in printing. With the aid of our new associate editor, we are now preparing copy ahead of time, to avoid delays in going to press. Thanks for your patience and understanding.

NICAP NYC

The first official NICAP affiliate has been formed by members in New York City. The charter of the group, to be known as "NICAP NYC," was approved on July 16th by NICAP. A nucleus of 12 members in New York combined to submit a detailed charter carefully outlining provisions for working closely with NICAP in its efforts to conduct an impartial investigation of UFOs.

Here are some of the key charter points:

(1) To be an affiliate member, one must first be a member of NICAP.
(2) The affiliate accepts no policy other than NICAP's stated policy of impartial investigation.
(3) Publicly expressed opinions of individual members shall be identified as personal opinions only.
(4) The affiliate shall be notified promptly of NICAP acceptance of any claims relative to UFOs.
(5) The affiliate shall have a Board of Directors consisting of a maximum of 9 members which will review all matters of importance and act upon them.
(6) The Board of Directors shall appoint an investigations committee to investigate incidents and claims, and to report all findings to the Director of NICAP.

About contact claims, and such theories as those involving the origin and propulsion of UFOs, the group has elected to reserve judgment until conclusive proof or disproof has been obtained. Instead, they have adopted a policy of endeavoring to prove to the American public the need for a serious and intelligent study of UFOs.

NICAP congratulates the New York members on becoming the first affiliate. We will report subsequent news of NICAP NYC and of any future affiliates.

Resignations

We regret to announce the resignation of Mrs. Rose H. Campbell, Administrator-Treasurer of NICAP. Mrs. Campbell has played a vital part in NICAP's operations since its inception, working much of the time without pay, and also generously donating funds at a critical time. But for her valuable services, NICAP could not have struggled through the difficult months of 1957.

Because of her personal beliefs, Mrs. Campbell at first urged the Director to give priority to certain "contactee" reports – claims of contact or communication with spacemen or space ships. Later, she accepted NICAP's basic policy of concentrating first on verified sightings and other proven evidence, to gain public acceptance of the serious UFO problem. For months, she even urged opponents to abide by this policy, as in the best interests of all concerned.

In recent weeks, however, Mrs. Campbell has frankly rejected the NICAP policy on contactee claims, urging that our publications give favorable consideration and approximately 50% space to contactee stories. We give her full credit for the courage of her beliefs in publicly rejecting the policy and in resigning to fight for her beliefs.

Though most member letters have endorsed this NICAP policy, which has been accepted by our Board of Governors, a test-vote was recently taken in the Washington area. The great majority of these members voted to retain the policy. (See your vote form elsewhere in this issue.)

Recalling all the months of Mrs. Campbell's willing cooperation and splendid service, we deeply regret her decision to concentrate on a phase which has often led to public ridicule and handicapped serious investigations.

In resigning, Mrs. Campbell has frankly warned that she plans to fight NICAP. Possibly this will be through a new contactee-publication, by lectures, or by direct mail to NICAP members. At a time when NICAP needs united support, it is unfortunate that a former NICAP official should believe it necessary to launch such an attack. We fully recognize her right to criticize, subject to answer by NICAP. However, we earnestly hope that in calmer reflection Mrs. Campbell will again realize the justice of NICAP's policies. Regardless, we shall not forget her months of hard work and true sacrifice, and we sincerely hope she will not remain embittered over the contactee policy.

We also regret that NICAP is losing the very helpful services of Mrs. Bessie M. Clark, administrative assistant, who was brought into NICAP by Mrs. Campbell in the summer of '57. Mrs. Clark has played an important part in our operations.

Despite our differences of opinion, we are truly sorry for the circumstances which have led to the loss of these two valuable assistants.

Coast Guard Prohibited From Releasing "SEBAGO " Report

The Acting Commandant of the Coast Guard, Rear Admiral J.A. Hirshfield, has told NICAP that the official UFO sighting report from the cutter "Sebago" was forwarded, as required, to the Department of Defense.

"Federal law prohibits release of official files concerned with such cases to other than specified channels," stated Admiral Hirshfield. "I therefore find it necessary to deny your request for this information."

In a subsequent interview with a designated Coast Guard representative, NICAP was told that the officers and radarmen involved in the famous "Sebago" case are still assigned to their customary duties. The Coast Guard representative agreed this would not be true if their superiors had believed them incompetent as a result of the UFO reports.

Just after the "Sebago" sighting, in November, 1957, the cutter's commanding officer radioed a full report which was made public at the Coast Guard offices in New Orleans. The report disclosed that the "Sebago's" radarmen had tracked the UFO for several minutes, that it maneuvered around the ship in concentric circles, that its speed at one point was about 1000 mph, and that the UFO also was seen by two 'eck officers and described as a brightly glowing object.

The Air Force, in a press statement, later implied the officers and radarmen were incompetent, stating they had been misled by seeing and tracking ordinary aircraft.

The Coast Guard has politely declined to argue this publicly with the AF. However, its representative told NICAP they were sure most of the Air Force did not believe that the Coast Guard personnel were poorly trained or incompetent.

Regarding the Federal law mentioned by Admiral Hirshfield, it was explained that this referred to JANAP 146, which is binding on all the armed forces. Thus, for the first time, the U.S. Coast Guard has confirmed the official censorship of UFO reports.

Two UFOs Sighted from page 1

a daylight observation of Venus when two copper-like discs passed to the south and then turned to the east. They had a diameter of about 30' of arc, approximately the same apparent diameter as the sun. Between 1:12 and 1:20 p.m. EST he saw two more discs, which passed overhead. They appeared to be discs with slightly raised portions in the middle.

At 7:58 p.m. EST September 6, 1954, Doctor Bartlett saw four lights in line formation. When an airliner came overhead, the lead light pulled away, while the other three climbed into a stratified formation, they then re-formed into a line formation, as before. Doctor Bartlett states that he was impressed by the precision and highly controlled performance exhibited by these objects.

On the night of July 12, 1957, Doctor Bartlett made his latest sighting to date during an observation of Jupiter. This is the only sighting which occurred through a telescope. (Elsewhere in this issue Doctor Bartlett and Dr. Clyde Tombaugh disclose why it is almost impossible to track a UFO by telescope, especially with the giant telescopes used by today's observatories.) In a later issue we hope to give the technical details of the 1957 sighting, which impressed Doctor Bartlett even more than the two huge UFOs he saw in 1953.

It is significant that until he had first-hand knowledge of UFOs, Doctor Bartlett accepted the explanations publicized by Dr. Donald Menzel of Harvard. In his statement to NICAP, Doctor Bartlett says he now rejects these explanations as not applying to all sightings.

"My belief in UFOs is simply expressed," he says. "UFOs do exist. They are some type of mechanism, controlled craft, their origin unknown. Beyond this, I have no definite conclusion. It has not been scientifically proven that they are interplanetary. At the same time, it has not been scientificqlly proven that they are not. Such an explanation for them should be fully explored."

[*Editor's note: In future issues we shall present Doctor Bartlett's evaluation of the question of life on Mars and other important issues possibly linked with the UFO subject.*]

Hilton Story Cont. from page

2. A small amount of pre-cooling by approaching through the earth's shadow.

3. Need for very precise selection for the point of re-entry, between the "choice of being fried" if the space vehicle passes too close to the earth, or of disappearing into the depths of space if it is too far to achieve sufficient retardation.

4. Possibility that spin-stabilization will avoid the need for a tail on the vehicle.

5. Need for an aerodynamic vacuum to protect vital cargo (such as passengers *Ed.*) during re-entry from any altitude above a few hundred miles.

In addition, Dr. Hilton has suggested that the saucer-shaped craft enter the atmosphere almost upside down, so that the pilot's cockpit would become the center of the heat-free vacuum. As the speed decreased, the craft would be slowly rolled into normal position for further descent.

Though Dr. Hilton reserves his decision regarding the question of observation by beings from another world, it is interesting to note that the once-derided "flying saucer" shape is now being seriously considered for our future space explorations. Dr. Hilton's suggestions as to the space vehicle's maneuvers, and its electro-magnetic dispersal of heat, may also prove to be prophetic when we finally learn the technical phases of UFO operation.

Dr. Jung sets record Straight

from page

was generally accepted as factual, since there had been no denial from Doctor Jung. Accordingly, Mrs. Coral Lorenzen, Director of APRO, sincerely believed she was justified in reprinting the material from the British *Flying Saucer Review*. Prior to this she had written Doctor Jung to ask if he would serve as an honorary member of APRO. Doctor Jung agreed, confirming his interest in the subject.

4. On July 31, 1958, press wire stories appeared all over the US and in foreign countries quoting statements taken from the APRO bulletin's reprint of the *Flying Saucer Review* article. Sections which Doctor Jung had discussed hypothetically in the original interview were released as his exact views, with the headlines generally announcing Doctor Jung's opinion that the UFOs are real and possibly controlled by beings from another world.

5. When the press stories reached Doctor Jung in Zurich, he wrote Mrs. Lorenzen and asked for a copy of the British article to which she had referred in a previous letter. After deliberating, and with no indication of ill-feeling, Doctor Jung released a correction on August 13, 1958, stating his views as they were supposed to have been contained in the original article and also in later writings of his own. Doctor Jung, in a copy of the statement sent to NICAP, says he considers the re-publication by APRO to have been a regretful accident.

6. On August 22, 1958, Doctor Jung's secretary, Miss Jaffe, wrote the Director of NICAP most of the above details and stated, "As you assume, the English version of the interview Doctor Jung gave to Die Weltwoche was never submitted to Doctor Jung."

7. Meantime, denials which at times seemed to be sharply critical of the APRO statement had appeared in the press here and abroad, as released by Doctor Jung. The famous psychologist was quoted as saying that the flying saucers were nothing but "wishful thinking." There is no indication that this is his view in the press release sent to us by his secretary, although it is possible he may have enlarged on this in a personal interview with reporters at Zurich. However, the best indication of his stand is contained in his letter to NICAP's Director, which is quoted below:

Kusnacht-Zurich
Seestrasse 228
16.8.58

Major Donald E. Keyhoe
National Investigation Committee
On Aerial Phenomena
1536 Connecticut Avenue
Washington 6, D.C.

Dear Major Keyhoe,

Thank you very much for your kind letter! I have read all you have written concerning UFOs and I am a subscriber to the NICAP-Bulletin. I am grateful for all the courageous things you have done in elucidating the thorny problem of UFO-reality.

continued on Page 4

CONTACTEES TOLD TO RETURN NICAP CARDS

On August 18, 1958, the following telegram was sent to seven contactees who had mistakenly received NICAP membership cards without the knowledge of the Director:

"By addressograph list error, you received a NICAP membership card which was never authorized and is void. You have never been a NICAP member. You were meant to receive only publications dealing with your claims. By mistake your addressograph plate was not canceled thereafter. Please return unauthorized membership card. Any use now will constitute false pretenses."

(Signed) Major Donald E. Keyhoe
Director of NICAP

The seven persons concerned were: George Adamski, Orfeo Angelucci, Truman Bethurum, Howard Menger, Buck Nelson, Reinholdt Schmidt and George Van Tassel. The telegram to Mr. Adamski was altered to include the following:

"Please return unauthorized membership card immediately. You have been warned by telephone and by my previous telegrams. Any further claim to honorary NICAP membership will be false pretenses and will be dealt with as such."

To date, unauthorized membership cards have been returned by Orfeo Angelucci, George Van Tassel, Howard Menger and Truman Bethurum. Mr. Adamski has promised, by telephone, not to repeat his membership claim and to explain the circumstances, but has not returned the NICAP card.

Months before, these seven contactees had been listed to receive NICAP material dealing specifically with their claims that they had met or communicated with space beings. None of the Board of Governors nor the Director had ever intended their retention on the mailing list, nor were they aware of this situation until after a claim to honorary membership broadcast by Mr. Adamski.

An order was issued by the Director, August 18, removing all seven names from the list, and strict steps have been taken to prevent any repetition of such an incident. No contactee has ever received, or will receive, any favored attention, public or private, from this Committee, since all such claims are still under NICAP investigation.

It must be admitted that the seven men concerned had reason to believe a free membership was purposely sent them by NICAP. But it seems peculiar that not one wrote NICAP to acknowledge receipt of the card or to ask the reasons. Also it is only fair to say that none but Adamski made any public claims, and with the exception of Mr. Bethurum the cards returned were sent back with courteous letters. (Mr. Menger has since become a paid-up regular member, which is the privilege of any non-Communist citizen.)

It is hoped that all members who hear of the "unauthorized cards" affair will immediately correct the false impression caused by Mr. Adamski's broadcast.

JUNG

Continued

The article in APRO-Bulletin July 1958, which caused all that stir in the press, is unfortunately inaccurate. As you know I am an alienist and medical psychologist. I have never seen an UFO and I have no first hand information neither about them, nor about the dubious attitude of the A.A.F. On account of this regrettable lack I am unable to form a definite opinion concerning the physical nature of the UFO-phenomenon. As I am a scientist, I only say, what I can prove and reserve my judgment in any case where I doubt my competence. Thus I said: "Things are seen, but one does not know, what." I do neither affirm, nor deny. But it is certain beyond all possible doubt that plenty of statements about UFOs are made and they are of all sorts. I am chiefly concerned with this aspect of the phenomenon. It yields a rich harvest of insight into its universal significance. My special preoccupation does neither preclude the physical reality of the UFOs nor their extraterrestrial origin, nor the purposefulness of their behaviour etc. But I do not possess sufficient evidence, which would enable me to draw definite conclusions. The evidence available to me however is convincing enough to arouse a continuous and fervent interest. I follow with my greatest sympathy your exploits and your endeavours to establish the truth about the UFOs.

In spite of the fact that I keep my judgment concerning the nature of the UFOs – temporarily let us hope -- in suspense, I thought it worthwhile to throw a light upon the rich phantasy material, which has accumulated itself round the peculiar observations in the skies. Any new experience has two aspects: (1) the pure fact and (2) the way one conceives of it. It is the latter I am concerned with. If it is true that the A.A.F. or the Government withholds telltaling facts, then one can only say, that this is the most unpsychological and stupid policy one could invent. Nothing helps rumors and panics more than ignorance. It is selfevident, that the public ought to be told the truth, because ultimately it will nevertheless come to the daylight. There can be hardly any greater shock than the H-bomb and yet anybody knows of it without fainting.

As to your question about a possible hostility of the UFOs I must emphasize, that I have no other knowledge about them, than that, which everybody can get out of printed reports. That is the reason, why I am still far from certainty about the UFO's physical reality.

Thank you for your kind offer to send me clippings. I got enough of them. It is a curious fact, that whenever I make a statement, it is at once twisted and falsified. The press seems to enjoy lies more than the truth.

I remain, dear Major,

yours

/s/ C. G. Jung

Moseley Blames NICAP For Former Regime Failings

In the August-September issue of "Saucer News," its editor, James W. Moseley, published a criticism of NICAP based largely on plans envisioned by the previous regime – plans rejected in January, 1957, by the Board of Governors and replaced with a program better suited to NICAP's small staff.

On first reading of this criticism, it was believed the facts had been maliciously distorted. It was thought this was possibly an effort to interest prospective subscribers through a contrived controversy, or even an attempt to destroy what Mr. Moseley might consider a rival organization.

Since then, through correspondence with Mr. Moseley, we find that he honestly misinterpreted the partial information he had. Also, it appears he was purposely misled by a source he describes as "close to the NICAP staff." (We know no such source; possibly someone is falsely pretending close contact.)

Mr. Moseley has been invited to visit NICAP's office, to inspect our financial and other records, to observe the workload and lack of adequate help, and to ask questions about any phase of our operations. We believe if he had done this before, he would have realized an attack was completely unwarranted.

NICAP hopes Mr. Moseley will accept this invitation. Meantime, in fairness to our members and the staff we shall answer his basic points. (See also the Director's Report, which clarifies Mr. Moseley's question about finances.)

1. Moseley: T.T. Brown, former NICAP chairman, envisioned ten administrative sections and sub-committees, a monthly journal "Project Skylight" and a magazine "Space Flight," for an annual $15 fee, a short newsletter for $7.50.

NICAP: These plans and a correspondingly large budget were rejected by the Board of Governors in January 1957. (Mr. Brown received only $175 cash for his five months' work.)

2. Moseley: What became of the publications promised to many who paid $15?

NICAP: All $15 members (total less than 100) were offered an extra year, at the new $7.50 rate, or a refund. An integral part of the new rate was substitution of the "Newsletter," later named The UFO INVESTIGATOR, for the two publications planned by Brown.

3. Moseley: We were led to expect a monthly 32-page publication at $7.50 a year. Since Keyhoe took over, only four issues have been published – the fourth, only 8 pages.

NICAP: After the Director was definitely assured ample funds, a 32-page magazine was promised. The funds never came. Rather than give up, NICAP's tiny staff has worked overtime for months, two members sacrificing pay due them, to get out the issues it produced, plus several news bulletins. To offset the reduced publications, membership has

continued on page 5

CONGRESS UFO HEARINGS REVEALED BY REP. AYRES

Special hearings on the UFO problem, involving classified official information, have been revealed to NICAP by Representative William H. Ayres, (Rep.) of Ohio.

"Congressional investigations have been held," stated Rep. Ayres, "and are still being held on the problem of unidentified flying objects.

"Since most of the material presented to the Committees is classified, the hearings are never printed. When conclusions are reached, they will be released if possible."

Rep. Ayres' statement resulted from inquiries by NICAP member Melvin Knopp, West Richfield, Ohio, in following up NICAP suggestions to seek action through individual Representatives and Senators.

The Congressman's disclosure threw light on a statement made March 8, 1958, by Air Force Assistant Secretary Richard E. Horner. In a letter to Mike Wallace, which was read during Wallace's TV interview of NICAP's director Secretary Horner insisted that no Congressional hearings on UFOs had been held or were planned.

The extreme seriousness of the Congressional hearings is indicated by Rep. Ayres' statement that all the information presented was classified. This means that all the hearings were in executive or closed-door sessions. The Air Force's determination to keep the information from the public is proved by the fact that no printed records are kept – not even confidential copies for the committee members.

This is the first documentation from Capitol Hill which proves the Air Force policy on UFOs, namely: the secret admission of a serious UFO problem while publicly denying the UFOs' existence.

To date, the Air Force has remained silent regarding Rep. Ayres' disclosure. NICAP is in possession of statements from a number of Congressmen who disapprove of AF secrecy about unidentified flying objects. Congressional support for an end to the censorship is steadily growing. We again suggest that all NICAP members write their Representatives and Senators urging that the present secret hearings be opened to the press and the public.

(Please let us see any signed originals of your Congressmen's answers; we shall be glad to return them, if requested.)

Thanks for UFO clippings

Because of the shortage of office help, and the recent rise in postal rates, we regret we cannot thank each member individually for newspaper clippings sent us. This is to thank all of you who have forwarded clips and other information. We greatly appreciate the assistance and hope that later we can acknowledge every letter or card. Please continue to send us information, giving the name and date of the newspaper with each clipping. Several times, a single clipping has given us an important lead.

Moseley Article Cont.

been cut to $5.00, with all memberships extended accordingly. (Details in Director's Report.)

4. Moseley: NICAP will sell all UFO books, implicitly endorsing books with "contactee" claims.

NICAP: This plan, begun in good faith by a former staff member, was canceled by the Director well before Mr. Moseley's criticism. It was not discussed with the Director, but he accepts the blame for not catching the book-sale announcement in a press release to UFO groups. When he learned of it, the plan was killed because of the very point Mr. Moseley has since made – it would imply endorsement of unproven reports.

The staff member, who has since resigned, has been paid $61.67 by NICAP check for the amount realized in book sales and first credited to NICAP's account. Copies left over are the personal property of the former staff member and any future sales of these books will have no connection with NICAP.

5. Moseley frankly tells NICAP his next issue will criticize NICAP's former "fancy office," implying that wasted funds could have been used for research. (See Director's Report; briefly, we inherited the office from the former regime, moved to a cheaper fourth-floor office when it was available.)

6. Moseley: NICAP's Director selects sensational UFO reports to make the subject dark and mysterious; NICAP fails in scientific analysis.

NICAP: Official censors, not NICAP's Director, cause the mystery. UFO cases spotlighted by NICAP are chosen because they are best documented, also most likely to impress newspapers and the public, and thus offset ridicule. Re: scientific analysis, an Evaluations Chief and a Research Chief were listed by the Board, January, 1957. No funds have ever been available for the positions. But with the aid of Mr. Hall, new associate editor, we now have set up a system to select the most important data for evaluation by our Special Adviser experts. Lack of help alone has hindered scientific analysis.

In replying to Mr. Moseley, we hope to avoid a controversy. We repeat our invitation for him to visit NICAP, to get the facts first-hand. This invitation applies to all NICAP members.

Conditional Analysis of Object

Following our policy of impartial investigation, NICAP has agreed to a conditional analysis of an object submitted by Daniel W. Fry, who some time ago claimed contact and communication with a space being. The analysis was promised as contingent on receiving certain information which to date has not arrived at NICAP.

The object, about 2½ inches in diameter, ¼ inch thick, weighing about 2½ ounces, is gray in color, flexible, magnetically permeable and contains metal in suspension. However, there is nothing to indicate that it could not be of terrestrial origin.

NICAP BOARD STATES UFO CENSORSHIP PERIL

After a careful study of the facts, a majority of NICAP's Board of Governors has issued the following statement on official UFO censorship:

"From evidence in NICAP's possession, it is clear the Air Force has withheld and is still withholding information – including UFO sighting reports – on the subject of unidentified flying objects."

Board members joining in this conclusion are:

Major Dewey Fournet, Jr., USAF Reserve, former Intelligence officer on the AF UFO Project "Blue Book;" Reverend Albert Baller, Robbins Memorial Church, Greenfield, Mass.; Frank Edwards, noted radio and TV newscaster; Vice Admiral R. H. Hillenkoetter, USN, Ret., formerly Director of the Central Intelligence Agency; Dr. Marcus Bach, State University of Iowa; Rear Admiral H. K. Knowles, USN, Ret.; J. B. Hartranft, Jr., President, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association; Col. R. B. Emerson, US Army Reserve; Professor Charles A. Maney, Defiance College, Ohio; and Rev. Leon C. Le Van, New Jerusalem Christian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The chance that AF secrecy could cause serious results was pointed out in a separate statement by Vice Adm. Hillenkoetter, Prof. Maney, Col. Emerson, Dr. Bach, Frank Edwards, and Rear Adm. Knowles:

"We believe this (AF) policy to be dangerous since it makes it possible for the Soviet government to claim ownership of UFOs (or flying saucers.) Such a false claim might create a serious situation in this country."

Though the NICAP statement refers to AF secrecy, there is strong evidence that this policy is suggested – if not directly imposed – by a higher government agency. The Central Intelligence Agency is known to be involved, through its direct intervention in January 1953, when it assembled a group of scientists at the Pentagon to review the Air Force evidence and decide on future action. In addition, the National Security Council logically would carry weight in any top-level Government decision on keeping the facts from the public.

The danger from this secrecy obviously is greater today because of the Far East crisis. But it could be offset quickly if the controlling official group were to reverse its secrecy policy and make all the facts public. Official sighting reports and hidden conclusions reached during the 1944-58 period of UFO investigation will prove beyond question that the USSR could not possibly be the source for these unknown objects.

Request to members: Please send us names of friends and acquaintances who are interested in the UFO subject and might wish to join NICAP.

Sighting Round-Up

August 8th; Alamogordo, N.M.: About a dozen people, including a Holloman AFB engineer who asked that his name not be used, saw yellowish-amber lights flying at high speeds in all directions over the city. The engineer, who saw only one of the objects, said "I can understand why anyone seeing such a thing would hesitate to report it...It was incredible." He said that the object was solid and made maneuvers "that no aircraft could withstand."

Airports near Alamogordo said they had no planes or balloons up at that time, and could not account for the reports.

August 8th; Oshawa, Ontario, Canada: Police Chief Herbert Flintoff, and several members of the Oshawa police force, spotted two UFOs at about 8:30 pm. Flintoff said he stepped out of his office just in time to see a round golden object flash across the sky from west to east at terrific speed. Seconds later a similar object streaked over. Flintoff reported hearing a whirring sound as they passed.

August 9th; Romulus, Michigan: At least 32 people reported sighting a glowing object which maneuvered erratically in the sky near Detroit Metro Airport between 8:15 pm and midnight. Four State Troopers from the Flat Rock post were among the witnesses. One of them, Trooper Ronald Schoonmaker, said the object appeared to move ten times faster than a jet.

August 11th; Muskegon, Michigan: The Weather Bureau and Coast Guard station reported sighting two UFOs shortly before midnight. The objects, which could not be tracked by the Muskegon radar station, flashed alternate red and green lights. One hovered over the area for two and a half hours. Weather Bureau officials in the Flint area were flooded with similar reports at the same time.

August 12th-13th; Cleveland, Ohio: Dr. Jason J. Nassau, Case Tech astronomer, and at least 5 other professional observers saw over a two night period several moving pin-points of light which were not satellites. On August 12th, the same night that they were reported by hundreds of residents, Nassau saw one of the objects. He said, "The probabilities are that it was a jet airplane. But I don't know for sure." Next evening four of the Case Tech observers spotted two more moving lights around 11:00 pm. Dr. Nassau did not think the objects were space ships; however, in March he stated his opinion that life is not unique to the earth.

August 24th; Westwood, N.J.: Police patrolmen Richard Schulz and Richard McCabe reported sighting a glowing orange circular object at about 5:00 am. The object, at first apparently motionless, moved rapidly eastward and disappeared in a few seconds.

Please let us know of any factual UFO discussions on local radio or TV stations, especially those which contribute new, verified sighting reports.

Telescopes

For several years some opponents of UFO reality have tried to clinch the case with this statement:

"Not one UFO has ever been seen through the world's largest telescopes, which proves UFOs do not exist."

On July 29, 1952, Maj. Gen. John A. Samford, director of Air Force Intelligence, stressed this as a vital point. Our observatories constantly watch the skies, said he, and their failure to sight any UFO for the long periods of time required to approach the Earth has caused the Air Force to have very little enthusiasm for the spaceship answer.

It is probably true that none of the great observatory telescopes has ever spotted a UFO except by accident – certainly a sighting has not been long enough for an accurate record. Here is the explanation given by Dr. Clyde W. Tombaugh, discoverer of the planet Pluto.

Doctor Tombaugh's careful evaluation, which he wrote especially for NICAP is as follows:

The large telescopes cannot deal very successfully with rapidly moving UFOs. I doubt if there is a single professional astronomical telescope that has slewing (cq) rates of motion to keep up with an UFO. After all, they weigh many tons and it would be unsafe for the instrument to attempt a rapid acceleration in motion.

If there is such a telescope it would require the most skillful manipulation of a two-man team (one manning the finder and slewing (cq) with the control box) to get such an object into the small angular field of view of the large telescope.

If the latter could be attained, the image plane would have to be quickly located by racking the film holder outward by an inch or so (depending on the focal length of the telescope and the slant distance of the object, the latter of which is rapidly changing).

Most astronomical research is spectrographic. This would require interrupting some long exposure spectrogram, removing a 100-lb. spectrograph, and attaching a direct image plane plate holder.

Most large telescopes peer out through a narrow opening in the dome, and the astronomers would be unable to see a UFO in some other part of the sky.

Large telescopes are not used in the daytime. It requires several minutes to even open the massive shutters of a large dome and even longer to revolve the dome opening to the proper position in the sky.

Wide-angle sky cameras have too short a focal length to yield enough scale. The best prospect is with an amateur's 6-inch reflecting telescope for a visual observation, and little hope of a photograph (with such a telescope).

Because of the difficulty of acquiring a UFO in the field of view, the best compromise would be a pair of binoculars of 6 to 10 power. Anything more than this requires a two-person team, one to man the finder and slew (cq) the telescope while the other looks through the telescope. Even then, the jerky motion is greatly magnified – resulting in a rather unsatisfactory view.

A.F. Office Bottles Up GOC Reports

A GOC area supervisor, dissatisfied with Air Force handling of UFO reports, recently gave NICAP important information about UFO sightings in California. In the early months of 1958, the supervisor stated, there were many reports centering around one town in California. The witnesses included retired high-ranking military officers, town officials, and many other respectable citizens.

Many of these area reports, it was learned, were never forwarded to ATIC by local AF authorities as regulations require; yet, according to the official GOC orders, UFO reports are classified as "special action," ranking them with incidents of hostile enemy action in so far as priority is concerned.

Disturbed by the fact that these unquestionably reliable reports were never organized into a "whole story" in spite of GOC efforts, the supervisor offered to forward all good reports to NICAP.

NICAP COMMENT: It is possible that public AF statements ridiculing UFOs have reacted upon some AF personnel handling UFO information. Since the existence of UFOs is publicly denied by the AF, those responsible for expediting reports may have been misled into glossing over or ignoring information received from GOC centers. The AF policy of public denial and secret investigation thus may have backfired and limited the flow of information to ATIC and higher headquarters. NICAP's 8-point plan offering cooperation with the AF, to avoid just such stagnation of facts, still stands. We are grateful to the GOC supervisor for calling this situation to our attention.

Membership Cards

Members are advised that their membership cards, enclosed with the July Confidential Bulletin (or sent later to new members) do not confer any *official* authority. NICAP is a private organization, free to operate independently since it is not an official agency.

NICAP membership cards are meant for purposes of introduction to witnesses of UFO sightings and to other persons seriously interested in the subject. Because of NICAP's reputation as a serious fact-finding organization, these cards should assist any tactful member to secure the cooperation of UFO witnesses – except of course those who are under official orders to withhold information.

It should be pointed out that NICAP wishes information for evaluation, that we shall not ridicule witnesses nor even quote them without permission. The question of such permission should be made clear, and we shall appreciate knowing the reaction in each case.

Courteous use of your NICAP membership card will undoubtedly bring favorable reactions and win new friends for this organization.

If any unexpected situations arise connected with the use of NICAP cards, we shall try to answer your questions promptly.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO NICAP MEMBERS

Dear NICAP Members:

The Board of Governors and I need your help, your opinions on serious questions. Recently, Washington-area members voted on these key issues. If you agree with their majority vote, NICAP's success is certain.

I wish we could talk face to face. But NICAP now covers all 49 States and 26 countries, so this informal discussion will have to serve.

In the past 20 months, NICAP has won recognition as a reputable, fact-finding organization. Its members include scientists, engineers, pilots, astronomers, electronics and rocket experts, Intelligence officers – a cross-section of respected citizens, both men and women, in most professions and trades.

NICAP Board statements and press releases from our magazine have been quoted widely – and seriously – by the press. Also, appearances on national networks have promoted wide interest in NICAP and its work. We are now cooperating with members of Congress who oppose official secrecy on Unidentified Flying Objects.

Other important developments are pending. But unfortunately we also face serious problems. NICAP is under increasing attack. Some criticism is justified; much of it is unfair. A few critics are honest in their views; some maliciously try to destroy NICAP and all it has achieved.

Because NICAP opposes secrecy on UFOs, one attack comes from the Air Force. Though serious, this is not grave. Many influential people, besides Congressmen, also are fighting the censorship. However, a few NICAP members suggest we should cease to oppose the AF. I feel, with the Board members, that the truth will never be known until secrecy ends. We are not endangering our country. Even the Pentagon admits national security is not involved. Please indicate your opinion in the vote-box on page 7.

Another attack, answered in the previous issue, charges that NICAP is a smokescreen helping the AF to hide the facts. NICAP's struggle, and my own personal fight against censorship, should prove this charge ridiculous. Please vote: Do you believe NICAP a tool of the AF?

The third attack concerns various persons' claims to having met or communicated with space beings. NICAP policy is to list these "contact" stories for detailed investigation later, but to give priority to fully verified UFO developments and sightings. Our first goal is serious acceptance by press and public of UFO reality. If we concentrated on unproven "contact" stories – and there have been hoaxes – it could lead to ridicule of NICAP. Question: Do you agree with this policy?

The fourth is a general attack, criticizing NICAP's failure to publish on schedule, alleging waste of funds and other flaws. (See item on Moseley.) This requires a detailed reply.

NICAP, a non-profit organization, was incorporated Aug. 29, 1956, with T. Townsend Brown in charge. To carry out his optimistic plans would have taken at least 50,000 members. With less than 100, Brown resigned in January, 1957. The Board approved his basic plan, to evaluate and publish authentic UFO information. To carry on, the Board approved the jobs of Director, Editor, Evaluations Chief, Research Chief, Public Relations Chief, Promotions Chief and Office Manager, with clerical help as needed. I accepted the Director's job with the hope of building up NICAP, then later aiding a new Director, as a consultant.

NICAP was heavily in debt to several firms. It owed back rent, at $175 a month, and we could not move our equipment from the large office we inherited. But two $5,000 donations were definitely promised me, with a firm assurance that more funds, from $50,000 up, would be secured in a short time.

The staff then consisted only of Mrs. Rose Hackett (later Mrs. R. H. Campbell) and myself. But with funds and help supposedly assured, we offered members a 32-page monthly magazine and bulletins, at $7.50 a year. This replaced Brown's plan for two publications, at $15; the $15 members were listed for two years.

Then the blow fell. Because of outside pressure and ridicule, the promise of funds was withdrawn. Mrs. Campbell (to use her present name) and I could have resigned. NICAP is a corporation; we could not be held for its debts. But we believed in NICAP; I felt morally obligated to friends and readers of my books who had joined. We stayed on, persuaded creditors to wait, paid our own expenses and used volunteer and part-time help to keep going.

Slowly NICAP grew. We paid debts in instalments, gradually bought office equipment formerly rented. At an under-par salary, we hired Mr. Lee Munsick, experienced UFO investigator, as associate editor. With only three people, work inevitably piled up – hundreds of letters were unanswered, the membership campaign slowed down. Working six, often seven days a week, even at nights, we finally got out the long delayed No. 1 magazine. Another delay, until Mrs. Campbell anonymously paid the overdue printing bill, and we got out the No. 2 issue. Then Munsick, with expenses surpassing his salary, had to leave for a better job. With about 35,000 words of copy to write alone, I was unable to finish the third issue until the Christmas holidays.

Knowing the lack of funds and help, few members complained – for which I shall always be grateful.

After the November 1957 sighting "flap," membership had increased. In early '58, the Armstrong Theater, Mike Wallace and Long John UFO programs also brought new members. By now, Mrs. Campbell had an assistant, Mrs. Bessie Clark, and I hoped for a new editor.

Please vote yes or no to the following questions, and check here if you wish your vote kept confidential.

☐ Yes ☐ No

1. Should NICAP keep trying to end secrecy about UFOs?

   ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

2. Do you think NICAP is a smokescreen, an AF cover-up?

   ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

3. Do you agree with NICAP's policy on contact stories?

   ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

4. Do you vote for re-election of the Board of Governors, as named, until Oct. 1, 1959?

   ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

5. Will you do everything possible to help promote NICAP, secure new members and end the financial crisis?

   ☐ Yes. ☐ No.

Please write any comments or suggestions here, then tear off this section and mail it to NICAP, 1536 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 6, D. C.

.....

.....

.....

Director's Report Cont.

Then censorship tightened, press stories on UFOs declined – and memberships sagged. Again, we faced overdue bills for printing, rent, office supplies. In this crisis, we cut the magazine to 8 pages; it was that or nothing. To offset this, and the delays, we also cut memberships to $5.00, listing the $15 members for three years, the $7.50 members for 1½. On this new basis, we planned to publish a magazine one month, a bulletin the next, hoping eventually to resume the old schedule.

This present issue had to be published on a cash basis; it was made possible only by renewals, gift memberships and donations at the Washington-area meeting and by a few other members.

These are painful facts. The figures that support them also will be painful, though the Washington-area members reacted courageously and I am sure most members will do the same. The situation boils down to this:

NICAP owes its continued existence to two things:

A. Extra support by a small per cent of its members, through founder memberships, pledges, securing new members and outright contributions.

B. Subsidizing of NICAP by Mrs. Campbell and myself. In 1956 Mrs. Campbell drew no salary; in 1957, she drew a salary of not over $2000; for Jan. to Sept. 1958, it will be not over $1000. In 1957, I accepted a Board listing at far less than my normal writing and lecturing income. Of the agreed amount, I have drawn less than half the salary – $2805 for 11½ months in 1957, and an expected maximum of $1400 for 1958.

This is not a complaint; I could have resigned early in '57. It *is* an explanation of how NICAP has kept going.

The full financial report (available to all NICAP members at this office) would require too much space, but the key 1957 figures will give the picture. NOTE: This copyrighted financial report is for NICAP members, and is not released for publication.

For 1957, printing, $4802.07; postage, $1627.95; taxes, $457.66; telephone, telegraph, express and messenger service, $981.73; office equipment rent (later applied to purchase) and direct purchases, $2244.68; office supplies, $506.08; outside typing services (part-time workers) $1168.48; notes repaid, $128.45; associate editor, 5 months, $900; office assistant, 3 months, $540; rent at $175 monthly (arranged by former regime and now reduced to $100) $2275. Cash balance at end of year, $1.40. The 1958 picture is even worse.

An inspection of the NICAP office should disprove any charge of wasted funds. Desks, file cases, typewriter, and all equipment but the Dictaphone are second-hand. Publications, formerly sent first-class because of long delays, now will go second-class. We have even considered changing to mimeographed publications, but this would save very little in printing and mailing costs.

The loss of Mrs. Campbell and Mrs. Clark obviously will increase the workload. But with volunteer and part-time help Mr. Hall and I will do all we can to handle the mail, office records and files, check on UFO information and prepare the publications. We will not only keep NICAP going, we will catch up and stay on schedule – *if* we get full membership support and end the constant financial strain.

But we must have increased income immediately.

No miracle is needed – only united support. For example, here is what was done at the Washington-area meeting:

1. A number of members renewed, on the $5.00 basis. If you have been a member one year, at $7.50, you are already credited with six added months. For $2.50 more, you will be listed for the entire second year.

2. Several Washington members gave gift subscriptions, or secured additional members at the new $5.00 rate.

3. Other members made contributions, depending on their ability to help.

Not everyone can afford to contribute or donate gift subscriptions. But the majority *can* get us new members.

Support by only a small percentage will not save NICAP this time. Our overdue printing bill alone is $1500. Unless mass support comes quickly, we face these two alternatives:

1. To suspend operations until financial support does come.

2. To end NICAP, just as we near our first goal.

Either way, it would be a tragedy. Air Force censors would claim we had quit because we found the "saucers" were an illusion. Aroused Congressional interest in open hearings would soon fade. Secrecy would win, and all serious UFO investigation would suffer a great setback.

But there is absolutely no need to fail. Full-scale support will quickly cover all bills, pay for publications on schedule and permit hiring the office help so badly needed.

We have a mass of factual information to back up Congressional hearings; important articles and reports are ready for the next magazine and bulletins; a new evaluation system and other needed projects are laid out, ready to go when we get the needed backing.

I am sure that NICAP's members will end the financial threat – for good. But with or without NICAP, I intend to keep on fighting, to help break the censorship and make public the truth.

In the vote-box, you will find the questions already cited, also space for your vote to continue the present Board of Governors for another year. These distinguished citizens, serving without pay, have courageously and publicly backed NICAP's operations and helped in shaping policy and in other valuable ways. The names follow:

Dr. Marcus Bach; Rev. Albert Baller; Dr. Earl Douglass; Col. Robt. Emerson; Mr. Frank Edwards; Major Dewey Fournet; Mr. J. B. Hartranft; Vice Adm. R. H. Hillenkoetter; Rear Adm. H. B. Knowles; Rev. Leon Le Van; Prof. Charles A. Maney.

In closing, I wish to thank you for your patience and understanding. I shall do everything in my power to help NICAP fulfill its promises and bring you the truth.

Sincerely,

Donald E. Keyhoe
Major, U.S. Marine Corps, Ret.
Director of NICAP

NATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE
ON AERIAL PHENOMENA
1536 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Washington, D.C.
Permit No. 41068